

Attachment A
WATERSHED RESTORATION PROJECT / GROUND-WATER RESTORATION PROJECT
 FY-2009 MONTANA 319 RANKING SCORING SHEET

Project Name: _____

Project Sponsor: _____

Reviewed by: _____

I General Considerations

***H/M/L/N**

A	Purpose of the Proposed Project	
A1	The purposes and objectives of the project are clearly tied to a TMDL, or a probable cause of impairment for a waterbody on the 303(d) list, or a Source Water Protection Plan.	
A2	The application clearly identifies how, when and why data will be collected and reported.	
B	Technical and Financial Feasibility	
B1	The applicant uses quality technical information to establish a clear linkage between the problem(s) to be addressed and the solutions proposed.	
B2	The applicant has reached out to all relevant Federal, State, local and private sources of funding/resources that may be available to help with the project. Matching funds demonstrate this effort.	
B3	Project costs are reasonable, and are within the specifications found in the Call For Grant Applications.	
B4	Sufficient technical and managerial resources are available to facilitate completion of the project, including consideration of past performance.	
B5	The application contains a well-crafted methodology for identifying stakeholders and encouraging/facilitating their participation as demonstrated through letters of support.	
B6	The application contains a quantifiable estimate of the overall effects that the proposed project will have on a pollutant load, water quality impairment or goals and objectives of a Source Water Protection Plan.	
C	Future Applicability and Usability	
C1	The project, or the knowledge and experience gained from the project, will be transferable to future projects in and outside of the watershed.	
C2	The project will produce baseline data that can be used to support future monitoring efforts. Application includes methods for appropriate data distribution.	
C3	The proposed project will build the capacity of the local watershed group to implement TMDLs.	
Recommended Ranking of Proposal:		_____

* Scoring is on a High, Medium, Low, or No based on the degree to which the applicant demonstrates that they have met the stated goal. **H=High, M=Medium, L=Low, N=No**

III. Funding Recommendation

Check
One Box
Only

FF	Fully Fund: Reviewer recommends this project receives all requested funds in the application	
PF+	Partial Fund (more than 50%): Reviewer recommends this project receive partial funds that would be more than 50% of request.	
PF-	Partial Fund (less than 50%): Reviewer recommends this project receive partial funds that would be less than 50% of request	
NF	Not Fund: Reviewer recommends this project does not receive funds.	

Reviewer comments and justification for funding recommendation:

General comments:

Budget Recommendations:

Additional information required from sponsor:

Attachment A
EDUCATION AND OUTREACH PROJECT
 FY-2009 MONTANA 319 RANKING SCORING SHEET

Project Name: _____

Project Sponsor: _____ Reviewed by: _____

**Section I scoring is a yes or no response. A no response will eliminate a proposal from further consideration.*

I. Project Priority

Check One
Box Only

A	Tier I is capped at \$25,000 and is designated for Mini-Grants. Applications for this Tier will <u>NOT</u> be accepted in this Call for Grant Applications but rather solicited under a separate Mini-Grant Call for Grant Applications in June of 2009 and January 2010.	NA
B	Tier II Project Priority	
B1	Top Priority Project: This project will develop, complete and/or implement a statewide or watershed wide E&O campaign identified in the 2007 Montana Nonpoint Source Management Plan's Five-Year Action Plan. Specifically, the E&O campaign targets 1) Urban growth and development issues; 2) Riparian and wetland buffer protection; or 3) Small farm and ranch conservation. Alternatively, E & O projects that carry out recommendations from initiated and/or completed TMDL also receive TOP PRIORITY status.	
B2	Other Project: This project will address statewide or watershed-wide needs to combat NPS pollution. Specifically, this project will include one or more of the following 1) Promotion, development and coordination of watershed groups; 2) Development and certification of volunteer monitors in watershed groups; 3) Establishing and expanding water curriculum in schools through coordination with statewide organizations; or 4) Development and promotion of BMP training for state, county and city road maintenance personnel.	

**Section II scoring is done by checking one box on the side. If no boxes are checked, the proposal will be eliminated from further consideration.*

II. General Considerations (Applicable to Tier I and II)

***H/M/L/N**

A	Purpose of the Proposed Project	
A1	The purposes and objectives of the project are clearly tied to Education and Outreach Five-Year Goals in the State's Nonpoint Source Plan, recommendations from a TMDL, efforts to combat NPS pollution, or the goals and objectives of a Source Water Protection Plan.	
A2	The application clearly identifies the target audience, and the target audience is directly linked to a source of impairment. If the target audience is not directly linked to a source of impairment (eg school children, targeted public, etc), the application explains how, over the long term, the project will contribute to the restoration and protection of water quality.	
B	Technical and Financial Feasibility	
B1	The applicant uses quality technical information to establish a clear linkage between the problem(s) to be addressed and the solutions proposed.	

B2	The applicant has reached out to all relevant Federal, State, local and private sources of funding/resources that may be available to help with the project. Matching funds demonstrate this effort.	
B3	Project costs are reasonable, and are within the specifications found in the Call For Grant Applications.	
B4	Sufficient technical and managerial resources are available to facilitate completion of the project, including consideration of past performance.	
B5	The application contains a well-crafted methodology for identifying stakeholders and encouraging/facilitating their participation as demonstrated by letters of support.	
C	Future Applicability and Usability	
C1	The project, or the knowledge and experience gained from the project, will be transferable to future projects in and outside of the watershed.	
C2	E&O products and reports will be made available to groups, agencies and individuals engaged in watershed activities.	
Recommended Ranking of Proposal:		

* Scoring is on a High, Medium, Low, or No based on the degree to which the applicant demonstrates that they have met the stated goal. **H=High, M=Medium, L=Low, N=No**

III. Funding Recommendation

Check
One Box
Only

FF	Fully Fund: Reviewer recommends this project receives all requested funds in the application.	
PF+	Partial Fund (more than 50%): Reviewer recommends this project receive partial funds that would be more than 50% of request.	
PF-	Partial Fund (less than 50%): Reviewer recommends this project receive partial funds that would be less than 50% of request.	
NF	Not Fund: Reviewer recommends this project does not receive funds.	

Reviewer comments and justification for funding recommendation:

General comments:

This image shows a blank sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and extend across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.